

REMARKS

Claims 15 and 16 are pending in the present case. Claim 15 is the only independent claim. By this amendment, claims 15 and 16 are amended for clarity to overcome the rejections under 112, 2nd paragraph.

Personal Interview Requested

Applicant respectfully requests a "Personal Interview" with the Examiner to discuss issues presented herein at the Examiner's convenience and prior to issuance of the next Official Office Action.

Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully asked to telephone Applicant's representative, Carolyn T. Baumgardner, at 703-205-8000 to schedule an interview.

The Claims Satisfy The Requirements Of 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd Paragraph

The final Office Action reject claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 15 and 16 obviates the rejection of claim 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Final Office Action indicates that:

Claims 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,936,744 to Choi (hereafter Choi) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,811,111 to Kurokawa (hereafter Kurokawa).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is distinguishable from the combination of Choi and Kurokawa for at least the following reasons:

The Examiner alleges that Choi discloses in col. 5, lines 8-10 an output operation for preparing a plurality of copies of recording sheets on which an image data signal received subsequent to the receipt of the identification signal is printed. (see final Office Action, page 4). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this allegation.

A close review of Choi merely reveals that a printer 70 prints out the receiving data according to the control signal from the central processing unit 10. However, Choi fails to disclose how many copies of an image data are printed by the printer 70. Choi merely discloses a print function without any further details about the amount of copies being printed.

The Examiner concedes that Choi fails to disclose repeatedly printing the image data signal. (see Final Office Action, page 4). However, the Examiner goes on to allege that it is commonly known in the art that some information, such as a sender's name or address, receiver's name or address, could be printed on each recording sheet. Furthermore, the Examiner alleges that Kurokawa discloses a facsimile machine that prints sender's and receiver's name together with the facsimile image data on each page of the recording sheets. (see Final Office Action, page 4).

In other words, it appears that the Examiner is alleging that the combination of Choi and Kurokawa discloses an output operation that includes "repeatedly printing sender's/receiver's information" with the facsimile image data on each page of the recording sheets. However, such a feature is not what is being claimed in the present invention.

For example, in the claimed invention the communication apparatus performs an output operation of repeatedly printing a plurality of groups of copies on recording sheets of an image data signal. In other words, the output operation prints more than one copy of the image data received subsequently to the identification signal.

Choi merely discloses that a printer prints out the received data without any indication about how many copies of the image data are being printed.

Furthermore, applicant submits that Kurokawa merely discloses that the source station information indicating the identity of the source station which transmits image data and the

destination station information which is supposed to receive the image data are transmitted from the source station to the destination station prior to transmission of the image data, so that the source and destination station information may be indicated at top of a hard copy produced at the destination station. (see Kurokawa, Abstract). In other words, Kurokawa merely discloses sending the source and destination information along with the image data and printing the source and destination information on each page of the image data.

However, this is not the same as repeatedly printing a plurality of groups of copies of an image data on recording sheets, as set forth in the present invention. The source and destination information of Kurokawa is not the same as the image data. Kurokawa itself classifies the source and destination information separately. For example, Kurokawa clearly states that the source and destination information is transmitted from the source station prior to transmission of the image data. As such, it goes to follow that it is the source and destination information that is repeatedly printed in Kurokawa, not the image data.

In contrast with Kurokawa, in the present invention the image data is repeatedly printed creating a plurality of groups of copies of the image data on recording sheets. Furthermore, the present case performs a process wherein each group of copies is bundled one by one after the output operation.

Applicant respectfully submits that both Choi and Kurokawa fail to teach or suggest repeatedly printing a plurality of groups of copies of the image data signal received. Furthermore, the cited art fails to teach or suggest bundling each group of copies one by one.

Again, a key aspect of the present invention is to prepare a plurality of groups of copies of an image data signal printed on recording sheets, when a received identification number from the originating communication apparatus coincides with a pre-stored identification number. In contrast with the present invention, in Choi if the sender's telephone number is not registered in the receiver's register memory, data reception is stopped. Furthermore, the facsimile machine of Kurokawa merely repeatedly prints sender's/receiver's information (header) together with the facsimile image data.

Thus, the combination of Choi and Kurokawa merely discloses that when the identification numbers coincide with each other, the facsimile machine repeatedly prints sender's/receiver's information. Additionally, this feature is not the same as that of preparing a plurality of groups of copies of an image data, as set forth in the present invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Choi and Kurokawa fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

To establish a *prima facie* case of Obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 706.02(j).

Applicant respectfully submits that the examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness at least in part because the examiner has failed to show how each and every feature is taught by the cited art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of cited art fail to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 15 is allowable over the combination of Choi and Kurokawa for at least the reasons noted above.

As for each of the dependent claims not particularly discussed above, these claims are also allowable for at least the reasons set forth above regarding their corresponding independent claims, and/or for the further features claimed therein.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 **to schedule a Personal Interview.**

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Dated: July 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant


CG/CTB/mpe